

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection has been made, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, de novo review is unnecessary when a party makes general and conclusory objections without directing a court's attention to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). In the absence of a specific objection, the court reviews the report and recommendation only for clear error. Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citation omitted); see also Tyler v. Wates, 84 F. App'x 289, 290 (4th Cir. 2003) (“A general objection to the entirety of the magistrate judge’s report is tantamount to a failure to object.”).

Pursuant to the power of the court to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the Commissioner’s decision with remand in Social Security actions under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and given the Commissioner’s intent not to object to the Report and Recommendation, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference, and it is hereby **ORDERED** that the decision of the Commissioner is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the case is **REMANDED** for further administrative proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joseph Dawson, III". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and a stylized "D".

Joseph Dawson, III
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
December 15, 2021